

The Commoner

ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered at the Postoffice at Lincoln, Nebraska, as second-class matter.

WILLIAM J. BRYAN, Editor and Proprietor
CHARLES W. BRYAN, Associate Ed. and Publisher
Edit. Rms. and Business Office, Suite 207 Press Bldg.

One Year.....\$1.00 Three Months..... .25
Six Months..... .50 Single Copy..... .10
In Clubs of Five or more per year... .75 Sample Copies Free.
Foreign Post, 25c Extra.

SUBSCRIPTIONS can be sent direct to The Commoner. They can also be sent through newspapers which have advertised a clubbing rate, or through local agents, where such agents have been appointed. All remittances should be sent by post-office money order, express order, or by bank draft on New York or Chicago. Do not send individual checks, stamps, or currency.

RENEWALS—The date on your wrapper shows the time to which your subscription is paid. Thus January 19 means that payment has been received to and including the issue of January, 1919.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—Subscribers requesting a change of address must give old as well as new address.

ADVERTISING—Rates will be furnished upon application.

Address all communications to—

THE COMMONER, LINCOLN, NEB.

STATE PRIDE AT A MINIMUM

Senator Hitchcock's appeal to state pride in support of his candidacy would have been stronger if he had ever shown any pride in his state, but his record is sufficient answer to any state pride argument. After the state went dry by a 29,000 majority, he had so little state pride that he voted with champions of the liquor interests against the submission of a national prohibition amendment. The senate voted five more than three to one for the amendment, and the Democrats voted just three to one. Mr. Hitchcock was one of the twelve Democrats who voted NO against thirty-six Democrats who voted YES. Not much state pride there.

Then on the subject of Woman Suffrage, he voted with a minority of the Democrats, and a minority of the senate, against suffrage at a time when his vote would have given to the Democrats the prestige of having submitted the amendment when the Democratic party was in control. And he voted against suffrage in spite of the request made by the legislature of Nebraska that he vote to submit the amendment. He did not show much pride in his state then.

He did not show much pride in his state when he joined the Republican members of the senate's currency committee, and tried to force Wall Street's financial views on the country. Nebraska was quite unanimously on the side of the currency bill, as the Democrats prepared and adopted it.

If there is any man in Nebraska, who has no right—and ought to be ashamed—to appeal to state pride to boost him, it is Senator Hitchcock.

W. J. BRYAN.

MR. HOOVER LOCATED

Mr. Hoover says he is not Mr. Bryan's kind of a Democrat (The World so quotes him). Well, Mr. Bryan has suspected it for several reasons; first, because the World offered him at auction to any party that would take him; second, he does not know to which party he belongs; third, he is not willing to help any party write its platform; fourth, he has been out of the country so long that he is out of touch with the American people; fifth, he has made a big fortune in a short time and has lived among rich people ever since.

When he says he is not Mr. Bryan's kind of a Democrat we may take it for granted that he is not in the same class with the more than six millions of Democrats who voted for Mr. Bryan three times, and that he is not in sympathy with the reforms which Mr. Bryan helped to secure. The people are acquainted with Mr. Bryan's kind of Democracy—they gave him a million more votes in 1896 than any previous Democratic candidate had ever received, and they made his vote the record Democratic vote for twenty years. We now have Mr. Hoover located and know what to do of him. We also know why he does not take the Democrats into his confidence and state his position on public questions.

Why Not Help Latin-America?

On another page will be found an extract from a speech which I made before the Latin-American Scientific Congress, September 3rd, 1916. The plan therein proposed of UNDERWRITING THE BONDS OF LATIN-AMERICAN COUNTRIES DESIRING MONEY FOR DEVELOPMENT WORK had never been tried; it was presented as a plan worthy of trial for reasons that will be found in the extract quoted. Since that time our nation has loaned the European allies some ten billions of dollars. When, therefore, we now speak of our country giving pecuniary aid to other governments, we can invoke precedent. If we can loan enormous sums to European nations, how can we refuse to lend our assistance to the Republics of our own Hemisphere? They are solvent and will grow in wealth as their resources are developed. There is more reason NOW for aiding them than there was four years ago, because Europe is powerless to supply their needs.

At a recent session of the Latin-American Financial Congress held in Washington, attention was called to the fact that the United States could help Europe by taking over European loans in Central and South Americas, that the money invested by European countries could be withdrawn and used at home. Here is a chance for us to convert our European loans into better securities and, at the same time, manifest our friendly interest in such a way as to compel the gratitude of our sister republics. Why not announce that we will accept from the nations to which we have loaned money, the bonds of any of the Latin-American Republics? We can afford to go even further and offer our credit to back up these countries in the development of their resources, in the building of railroads and in the extension of their educational systems. Being geographical neighbors to these republics we shall naturally profit more than European nations by their progress and advance in wealth.

All motives, therefore, that can influence us, combine to induce us to go to the relief to Central and South America at once. There should be no hesitation; the situation calls for immediate action.

W. J. BRYAN.

A DANGEROUS BIAS

A correspondent has sent in an extract from a speech made by Dr. Nicholas Murry Butler before the chamber of commerce of Philadelphia and by ex-President Taft before a banker's convention at Seattle. These extracts indicate that both of these men have a constitutional bias on the side of big corporations—a bias so strong that they condemn as dangerous the legislation which the masses deem necessary for the protection of the public. Of course, Mr. Taft and Mr. Butler are honest men and state their conscientious convictions, but neither honesty nor conscientiousness can excuse them for taking the position they do. In a country like this public men can not hope to win the plaudits of the voters if they misunderstand fundamental political principles. Mr. Butler and Mr. Taft seem to think that society is suspended from the top and that the rich will take care of the poor if the government will take care of the rich. They are mistaken. Economic blessings do not come down from the so called Captains of Industry; they come up from the people. Society is built from the bottom. When the people are prosperous, their prosperity finds its way up through all the classes that rest upon the masses. The two prominent Republicans above quoted, Dr. Butler and ex-President Taft, are very delightful men, but the election of either one to the presidency would be an invitation to the predatory interests to help themselves.

The quotations above referred to, are as follows:

Dr. Butler: "The cheaply won applause which is sure to follow the violent denunciation of somebody or something for an alleged wrong has been preferred to the much more solid and lasting approval of an intelligent people that would follow upon constructive acts which would indicate how the business of the country might be better and more wisely developed." Again, "it is a little short of pathetic after some of the best brains of the nation have organized and set on foot a great industrial undertaking which engages the co-operation of thousands of men and

women, reduces the cost of production of some staple articles and begins to extend American trade into new lands, to find them summarily brought to book as criminals by the attorney general of the United States or the district attorney in some judicial district."

Mr. Taft: "The hostilities of legislatures and of congress, consciously or unconsciously have come to be directed against all successful investment of capital without discrimination. The inquisitorial and nagging character of the powers of commissions for the close supervision of corporate activities have so frightened capital as to shrink investments and stop normal expansion in the business of the country. Nothing is so timid as capital and nothing is so easily able to take care of what it has. A hostile spirit manifested in legislation buttons up the pockets of those who control wealth that would otherwise be invested."

NEW "DRED SCOTT" CASE

Mr. Bryan made the following statement at Miami, Florida, February 27, regarding the demand of the New York Democrats for the repeal of prohibition:

"The New York Democrats have given the country a new Dred Scott decision and made prohibition the paramount issue until the liquor traffic ceases to menace the homes of the land. The demand made by the liquor interests, through the New York state convention, for legislation nullifying the Federal Constitution, is an attempt to reopen the question of state sovereignty versus national supremacy which was settled by the Civil War.

"For a quarter of a century the leaders of the Democratic party in New York have as a rule, represented Wall Street's predatory schemes. The national party for this reason found it necessary to repudiate New York leadership in order to save the party. It is impossible to believe that these leaders can regain control of the party by the service and unblushing championship of a crime-creating business that has been outlawed by thirty-four states' action and finally exterminated by a national amendment which has been ratified by forty-five States."

WHAT MAY HAPPEN

The Chicago Tribune says of the recent 4 to 3 decision in favor of the steel trust:

"The Constitution follows the flag," said Mr. Dooley in one of his most celebrated epigrams, "and the Supreme Court follows the election returns."

"If the opinion of the majority of the court in the suit against the United States steel corporation does not reflect actual election results it does express what is probably the prevailing public opinion respecting large combinations. For some years this opinion has tended to reject the theories of the earlier trust busters, that we can or ought to return to the period of unlimited competition and comparatively small corporations. It has tended to accept the theory that combination if regulated for the public protection may be beneficial up to a certain point."

If a Republican victory at a congressional election can change a steel trust into a blessing, what reactionary decisions may be expected if the Republicans win a presidential campaign.

LET THE RELATIVES DECIDE

Quite a controversy has sprung up as to the disposition of the bodies of the soldiers who died in Europe. As the relatives of some agree with Mr. and Mrs. Roosevelt and prefer to have the bodies of their kin sleep where they fell, and others desire the bodies of relatives returned, the Government will, doubtless, decide the question by following the wishes of the relatives. At any rate that would seem to be the fairest solution. No one in authority would care to take the responsibility of refusing to bring back a body if the relative desired it or of leaving the body in Europe if the relatives wanted it brought back.

W. J. BRYAN.

The Democrats in the several states should instruct on platform and on the kind of a candidate they want even if they are not sure about the name of the man.

Two wet candidates have withdrawn from the race for the Democratic nomination for President. Wise men. Next!